•	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	10/073,628	KIMELMAN ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Satish S. Rampuria	2191
All Participants:	Status of Application	1:
(1) Satish S. Rampuria.	(3)	
(2) MICHAEL BUCHENHORNER (Reg. No. 33,162).	(4)	
Date of Interview: 31 October 2007	Time:	
Type of Interview: ☑ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☑ No If Yes, provide a brief description:	cant's representative)	
Part I.		
Rejection(s) discussed: No.	•	
Claims discussed: 13,14,19,20		
Prior art documents discussed: No.		
Part II.		
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GEN See Continuation Sheet	ERAL NATURE OF WHAT	WAS DISCUSSED:
Part III.		
It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate directly resulted in the allowance of the application. T of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summa	The examiner will provide a record of the substance of	written summary of the substand of the interview, since the intervie

Application No. 10/073,628

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Examiner proposed an examiner's amendment by incorporating the limitations of claims 14 and 20 to their independent claims 13 and 20 respectively. The attorney of the record has granted the permission. Further, for claims 19-24 Examiner suggested to add the word 'storage', after the word readable to over come the potential 101 rejection. For details please refer to the Examiner's amendment.